

POSITIVE SOLUTIONS FOR A CLASS OF QUASILINEAR SINGULAR ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS

CLAUDIANOR O. ALVES AND ABDELKRIM MOUSSAOUI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we establish the existence of two positive solutions for a class of quasilinear singular elliptic systems. The main tools are sub and supersolution method and Leray-Schauder Topological degree.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the following system of quasilinear elliptic equations:

$$(P) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = u^{\alpha_1} v^{\beta_1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q v = u^{\alpha_2} v^{\beta_2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$) with $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary $\partial\Omega$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, Δ_p and Δ_q , $1 < p, q < N$, are the p -Laplacian and q -Laplacian operators, respectively, that is, $\Delta_p u = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u)$ and $\Delta_q v = \operatorname{div}(|\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v)$. We consider the system (P) in a singular case by assuming that

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -1 < \alpha_1 < 0 < \beta_1 < \min\{p-1, \frac{p^*}{p^*}(p-1-\alpha_1)\} \\ -1 < \beta_2 < 0 < \alpha_2 < \min\{q-1, \frac{q^*}{q^*}(q-1-\beta_2)\}. \end{cases}$$

In this case, system (P) is cooperative, that is, for u (resp. v) fixed the right term in the first (resp. second) equation of (P) is increasing in v (resp. u).

The study of singular elliptic problems is greatly justified because they arise in several physical situations such as fluid mechanics pseudoplastics flow, chemical heterogeneous catalysts, non-Newtonian fluids, biological pattern formation and so on. In Fulks & Maybee [13], the reader can find a very nice physical illustration of a practical problem which leads to singular problem.

With respect to singular system it is worth to cite, among others, the important Gierer-Meinhardt system which is the stationary counterpart of a parabolic system proposed by Gierer-Meinhardt (see [20, 11]) which occurs in the study of morphogenesis on experiments on hydra, an animal of a few millimeters in length.

Besides the importance of the physical application above mentioned, we would like to mention that from a mathematical point of view the singular problems are also interesting because to solve some of them are necessary nontrivial mathematical techniques, which involve Topological degree, Bifurcation theory, Fixed point

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J75; 35J48; 35J92.

Key words and phrases. Singular system; p -Laplacian; Leray-Schauder degree; regularity.

C.O. Alves was partially supported by CNPq/Brazil 304036/2013-7 and INCT-MAT.

A. Moussaoui was supported by CNPq/Brazil 402792/2015-7.

theorems, sub and supersolution Method, Pseudomonotone Operator theory and Variational Methods. Here, it is impossible to cite all papers in the literature which use the above techniques, however the reader can find the applications of the above mentioned methods in Alves & Moussaoui [3], Hai [21], Ghergu & Radulescu [19], Giacomoni, Hernandez & Moussaoui [15], Giacomoni, Hernandez & Sauvy [16], Hernandez, Mancebo & Vega, [22], Khodja & Moussaoui [24], Zhang [35], Zhang & Yu [36], Diaz, Morel & Oswald [12], Alves, Corrêa & Gonçalves [2], Crandall & Rabinowitz [10], Taliaferro [33], Lunning & Perry [27], Motreanu & Moussaoui [28, 29, 30], Moussaoui, Khodja & Tas [31], Agarwall and O'Regan [5], Stuart [32] and their references.

After a review bibliography, we did not find any paper where the existence of multiple solutions have been considered for a singular system. Motivated by this fact, we prove in the present paper the existence of at least two positive solutions for system (P). Our main result has the following statement:

Theorem 1. *Under assumption (1.1) problem (P) possesses at least two (positive) solutions in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.*

In the proof of the above theorem, we will use sub and supersolution method combined with Leray-Schauder Topological degree. However, before proving that theorem it was necessary to get some informations about the regularity of the solutions. To this end, the below result was crucial in our approach.

Theorem 2. *Assume (1.1) holds. Then, system (P) has a positive solution (u, v) in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, there exist a sub-supersolution $(\underline{u}, \underline{v}), (\overline{u}, \overline{v}) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ for (P) such that*

$$(1.2) \quad \underline{u}(x) \leq u(x) \leq \overline{u}(x) \text{ and } \underline{v}(x) \leq v(x) \leq \overline{v}(x) \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

In the present paper, a solution of (P) is understood in the weak sense, that is, a pair $(u, v) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$, with u, v positive a.e. in Ω , satisfying

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha_1} v^{\beta_1} \varphi \, dx, \\ \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v|^{q-2} \nabla v \nabla \psi \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha_2} v^{\beta_2} \psi \, dx, \end{cases}$$

for all $(\varphi, \psi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$.

The proof of Theorem 2 is done in Section 2. The main technical difficulty consists in the presence of singular terms in system (P) under condition (1.1). Our approach is based on the sub-supersolution method in its version for systems [7, section 5.5]. However, this method cannot be directly implemented due to the presence of singular terms in system (P). Applying the sub-supersolution method in conjunction with the regularity result in [21] under hypothesis (1.1), we prove the existence of a (positive) solution $(u, v) \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, of problem (P).

The proof of Theorem 1 is done in Section 3. It is based on topological degree theory with suitable truncations. Here, it suffices to show the existence of a second (positive) solution for problem (P). The first one is given by Theorem 2 which is located in a rectangle formed by the sub-supersolutions. However, due to the singular terms in system (P), the degree theory cannot be directly implemented. To handle this difficulty, the degree calculation is applied for the regularized problem (P_ε) for $\varepsilon > 0$. Under assumption (1.1), Theorem 2 ensures the existence of a smooth solution for (P) . This gives rise to the possible existence a constant $R > 0$

such that all solutions (u, v) with $C^{1,\gamma}$ -regularity satisfy $\|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}}, \|v\|_{C^{1,\gamma}} < R$. On the basis of this, we show that the degree of an operator corresponding to system (P_r) on a larger set is 0. Another hand, we show that the degree of an operator corresponding to the system (P_r) is 1 on an appropriate set. This leads to the existence of a second solution for (P_r) by using the excision property of Leray-Schauder degree. Then the existence of a second solution for (P) is derived by passing to the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

In what follows, we denote by $\phi_{1,p}$ and $\phi_{1,q}$ the normalized positive eigenfunctions associated with the principal eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,p}$ and $\lambda_{1,q}$ of $-\Delta_p$ and $-\Delta_q$, respectively:

$$(1.4) \quad -\Delta_p \phi_{1,p} = \lambda_{1,p} |\phi_{1,p}|^{p-2} \phi_{1,p} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \phi_{1,p} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi_{1,p}^p = 1$$

and

$$(1.5) \quad -\Delta_q \phi_{1,q} = \lambda_{1,q} |\phi_{1,q}|^{q-2} \phi_{1,q} \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \phi_{1,q} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \int_{\Omega} \phi_{1,q}^q = 1.$$

The strong maximum principle ensures the existence of positive constants l_1 and l_2 such that

$$(1.6) \quad l_1 \phi_{1,p}(x) \leq \phi_{1,q}(x) \leq l_2 \phi_{1,p}(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega.$$

For a later use we recall that there exists a constant $l > 0$ such that

$$(1.7) \quad \phi_{1,p}(x), \phi_{1,q}(x) \geq ld(x) \text{ for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where $d(x) := \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega)$ (see, e.g., [17]). Moreover, since $\phi_{1,p}$ and $\phi_{1,q}$ belongs to $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, there is $M > 0$ such that

$$(1.8) \quad M = \max_{x \in \overline{\Omega}} \{|\phi_{1,p}(x)| + |\phi_{1,q}(x)|\}.$$

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 2: EXISTENCE OF THE FIRST SOLUTION

Let us define w_1 and w_2 as the unique weak solutions of the problems

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p w_1 = w_1^{\alpha_1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_1 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_q w_2 = w_2^{\beta_2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_2 > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ w_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

respectively, which are known to satisfy

$$(2.2) \quad c_2 \phi_{1,p}(x) \leq w_1(x) \leq c_3 \phi_{1,p}(x) \text{ and } c'_2 \phi_{1,q}(x) \leq w_2(x) \leq c'_3 \phi_{1,q}(x),$$

with positive constants c_2, c_3, c'_2, c'_3 (see [17]). Consider $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ the solutions of the homogeneous Dirichlet problems:

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p \xi_1(x) = \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \xi_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}, \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_q \xi_2(x) = \phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2}(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \xi_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The Hardy–Sobolev inequality (see, e.g., [1, Lemma 2.3]) guarantees that the right-hand side of (2.3) belongs to $W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ and $W^{-1,q'}(\Omega)$, respectively. Consequently, the Minty–Browder theorem (see [6, Theorem V.15]) implies the existence of unique ξ_1 and ξ_2 in (2.3). Moreover, (2.1), (2.2), the monotonicity of the operators $-\Delta_p$ and $-\Delta_q$ yield

$$(2.4) \quad c_0 \phi_{1,p}(x) \leq \xi_1(x) \leq c_1 \phi_{1,p}(x) \text{ and } c'_0 \phi_{1,q}(x) \leq \xi_2(x) \leq c'_1 \phi_{1,q}(x) \text{ in } \Omega,$$

for some positive constants c_0, c_1, c'_0, c'_1 . Let z_1 and z_2 satisfy

$$(2.5) \quad -\Delta_p z_1(x) = h_1(x), \quad z_1 = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad -\Delta_q z_2(x) = h_2(x), \quad z_2 = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

where

$$(2.7) \quad h_1(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta, \\ -\phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) & \text{in } \Omega_\delta, \end{cases}$$

$$(2.8) \quad h_2(x) = \begin{cases} \phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2}(x) & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta, \\ -\phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2}(x) & \text{in } \Omega_\delta \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Omega_\delta = \{x \in \Omega : d(x) < \delta\},$$

with a fixed $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and $d(x) = d(x, \partial\Omega)$.

The Hardy-Sobolev inequality together with the Minty-Browder theorem imply the existence and uniqueness of z_1 and z_2 in (2.5) and (2.6). Moreover, (2.5) and (2.6), the monotonicity of the operators $-\Delta_p$ and $-\Delta_q$ and [21, Corollary 3.1] imply that

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{c_0}{2}\phi_{1,p}(x) \leq z_1(x) \leq c_1\phi_{1,p}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{c'_0}{2}\phi_{1,q}(x) \leq z_2(x) \leq c'_1\phi_{1,q}(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Next, our goal is to show the existence of sub and supersolution for (P) .

Existence of subsolution:

For a constant $C > 0$, we have

$$(2.10) \quad -C^{-(p-1)}\phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) < 0 \leq (C^{-1}z_1(x))^{\alpha_1}(C^{-1}z_2(x))^{\beta_1}, \quad x \in \Omega_\delta$$

and

$$(2.11) \quad -C^{-(q-1)}\phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2}(x) < 0 \leq (C^{-1}z_1(x))^{\alpha_2}(C^{-1}z_2(x))^{\beta_2}, \quad x \in \Omega_\delta.$$

Let $\mu > 0$ be a constant such that

$$(2.12) \quad \phi_1(x), \phi_2(x) \geq \mu \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta.$$

Then, since $\alpha_1 < 0 < \beta_1$, (2.9) and (2.12) lead to

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & C^{\alpha_1+\beta_1-(p-1)}\phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x)(z_1(x))^{-\alpha_1} \leq C^{\alpha_1+\beta_1-(p-1)}\phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x)(c_1\phi_{1,p}(x))^{-\alpha_1} \\ & = C^{\alpha_1+\beta_1-(p-1)}(Mc_1)^{-\alpha_1} < (c'_0\mu)^{\beta_1} \leq (c'_0\phi_{1,q}(x))^{\beta_1} \\ & \leq (z_2(x))^{\beta_1}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta, \end{aligned}$$

provided $C > 0$ large enough. This is equivalent to

$$(2.14) \quad C^{-(p-1)}\phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) < (C^{-1}z_1(x))^{\alpha_1}(C^{-1}z_2(x))^{\beta_1}, \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta.$$

Similarly,

$$(2.15) \quad C^{-(q-1)}\phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2}(x) < (C^{-1}z_1(x))^{\alpha_2}(C^{-1}z_2(x))^{\beta_2} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta,$$

for $C > 0$ large enough. The pair

$$(2.16) \quad (\underline{u}, \underline{v}) = C^{-1}(z_1, z_2).$$

is a subsolution for (P) . Indeed, a direct computation shows that

$$(2.17) \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla \underline{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{u} \nabla \varphi \, dx = C^{-(p-1)} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1} \varphi \, dx - C^{-(p-1)} \int_{\Omega_\delta} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1} \varphi \, dx$$

and

$$(2.18) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{v}|^{q-2} \nabla \underline{v} \nabla \psi = C^{-(q-1)} \int_{\Omega \setminus \Omega_{\delta}} \phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2} \psi \, dx - C^{-(q-1)} \int_{\Omega_{\delta}} \phi_{1,q}^{\beta_2} \psi \, dx,$$

where $(\varphi, \psi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with $\varphi, \psi \geq 0$. Combining (2.17), (2.18), (2.10), (2.11), (2.13) and (2.15), it is readily seen that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \underline{u} \nabla \varphi \leq \int_{\Omega} \underline{u}^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} \varphi$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \underline{v}|^{q-2} \nabla \underline{v} \nabla \psi \leq \int_{\Omega} \underline{u}^{\alpha_2} \underline{v}^{\beta_2} \psi,$$

for all $(\varphi, \psi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$ with $\varphi, \psi \geq 0$. This proves that $(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ is a subsolution for (P) .

Existence of supersolution:

Next, we prove that

$$(2.19) \quad (\overline{u}, \overline{v}) = C(\xi_1, \xi_2)$$

is a supersolution for problem (P) for $C > 0$ large enough. Obviously, we have $(\overline{u}, \overline{v}) \geq (\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for C large enough. Taking into account (2.3), (2.4), (1.8) and (1.1) we derive that in $\overline{\Omega}$ one has the estimates

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{u}^{-\alpha_1} \overline{v}^{-\beta_1} (-\Delta_p \overline{u}) &= C^{p-1-\alpha_1-\beta_1} \xi_2^{-\beta_1} \geq C^{p-1-\alpha_1-\beta_1} (c'_1 \phi_{1,q}(x))^{-\beta_1} \\ &\geq C^{p-1-\alpha_1-\beta_1} (c'_1 M)^{-\beta_1} \geq 1 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\overline{u}^{-\alpha_2} \overline{v}^{-\beta_2} (-\Delta_q \overline{v}) \geq C^{q-1-\alpha_2-\beta_2} (c_1 M)^{-\alpha_2} \geq 1 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega},$$

provided that $C > 0$ is sufficiently large. Consequently, it turns out that

$$(2.20) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \overline{u}|^{p-2} \nabla \overline{u} \nabla \varphi \, dx \geq \int_{\Omega} \overline{u}^{\alpha_1} \overline{v}^{\beta_1} \varphi \, dx$$

and

$$(2.21) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \overline{v}|^{q-2} \nabla \overline{v} \nabla \psi \, dx \geq \int_{\Omega} \overline{u}^{\alpha_2} \overline{v}^{\beta_2} \psi \, dx,$$

for all $(\varphi, \psi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \times W_0^{1,q}(\Omega)$.

Proof of Theorem 2 (conclusion):

Using (1.1), (1.7), (1.2), (2.16), (2.19), (2.9) and (2.4), we get

$$u^{\alpha_1} v^{\beta_1} \leq \underline{u}^{\alpha_1} \overline{v}^{\beta_1} \leq C_1 d(x)^{\alpha_1} \text{ for all } x \in \Omega$$

and

$$u^{\alpha_2} v^{\beta_2} \leq \overline{u}^{\alpha_2} \underline{v}^{\beta_2} \leq C_2 d(x)^{\beta_2} \text{ for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where C_1 and C_2 are positive constants. Then, owing to [24, Theorem 2] we deduce that there exists a solution $(u, v) \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, of problem (P) within $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \overline{v}]$. This complete the proof.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

According to Theorem 2 we know that problem (P) possesses a (positive) solution (u, v) in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, located in the rectangle $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \overline{v}]$ for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Thus, to prove Theorem 1 it suffices to show the existence of a second solution for problem (P) .

Before starting the proof of Theorem 1, we would like point out that by Theorem 2 the set of solutions (u, v) in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, for problem (P) is not empty. Then, without any loss of generality, we may assume that there is a constant $R > 0$ such that all solutions (u, v) with $C^{1,\gamma}$ -regularity satisfy

$$(3.1) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})}, \|v\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} < R.$$

Otherwise, there are infinity solutions with $C^{1,\gamma}$ -regularity and the proof of Theorem 1 is completed.

Hereafter, we denote

$$B_R(0) = \{(u, v) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : \|u\|_{C^1} + \|v\|_{C^1} < R\},$$

$$\mathcal{O}_R = \{(u, v) \in B_R(0) : \underline{u} \ll u \ll R \text{ and } \underline{v} \ll v \ll R\}$$

and

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \{(u, v) \in B_R(0) : \underline{u} \ll u \ll \hat{u} \text{ and } \underline{v} \ll v \ll \hat{v}\},$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad (\hat{u}, \hat{v}) = \Lambda(w_1, w_2)$$

with w_1, w_2 fixed in (2.1) and $\Lambda > 0$ is a constant which will be chosen later on. A simple computation gives that $\mathcal{O}_R$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ are open sets in $C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$.

In what follows, we will assume without loss of generality that

$$R > \max\{\|\underline{u}\|_\infty, \|\overline{u}\|_\infty, \|\underline{v}\|_\infty, \|\overline{v}\|_\infty, \|\hat{u}\|_\infty, \|\hat{v}\|_\infty\}.$$

In the sequel, we use the notation $u_1 \ll u_2$ when $u_1, u_2 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy:

$$u_1(x) < u_2(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \nu} < \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,$$

where ν is the outward normal to $\partial\Omega$.

The next proposition is useful for proving our second main result.

Proposition 1. *Assume (1.1) holds. Then all solutions (u, v) of (P) within $[\underline{u}, \overline{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \overline{v}]$ verifies*

$$(3.3) \quad u(x) \ll \hat{u}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad v(x) \ll \hat{v}(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Proof. From (2.19), (3.3), (1.1), (2.4), (1.7), (2.1) and (2.2), it follows that

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta_p u &= u^{\alpha_1} v^{\beta_1} \leq \underline{u}^{\alpha_1} \overline{v}^{\beta_1} \leq (C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p})^{\alpha_1} (C c'_1 \phi_{1,q})^{\beta_1} \\ &\leq C^{-\alpha_1 + \beta_1} (\frac{c_0}{2})^{\alpha_1} (c'_1 M)^{\beta_1} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1} \leq C^{-\alpha_1 + \beta_1} (\frac{c_0}{2})^{\alpha_1} (c'_1 M)^{\beta_1} (c_3 w_1)^{\alpha_1} \\ &< \Lambda^{p-1} w_1^{\alpha_1} = -\Delta_p(\Lambda w_1) = -\Delta_p \hat{u} \text{ in } \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

provided that Λ is large enough. Proceeding in the same way with the second equation in (P) results in

$$(3.5) \quad -\Delta_q v < -\Delta_q(\Lambda \xi_2) = -\Delta_q \hat{v} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

for Λ large enough. Consequently, the strong comparison principle found in [4, Proposition 2.6] leads to the conclusion. This ends the proof. $\square$

3.1. An auxiliary problem. In this subsection, we will use the Topological degree to get the second solution. However, the singular terms in system (P) prevents the degree calculation to be well defined. To overcome this difficulty, we disturb system (P) by introducing a parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. This gives rise to a regularized system for (P) defined for $\varepsilon > 0$ as follows:

$$(P_r) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = (u + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} v^{\beta_1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q v = u^{\alpha_2} (v + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u(x), v(x) > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We apply the degree theory for the regularized problem (P_r) . This leads to find a positive solution for (P_r) lying outside of the set $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Then the existence of a second solution of (P) is obtain by passing to the limit in (P_r) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The proof comprises four steps.

Remark 1. *It is very important to observe that the same reasoning exploited in the proof of Theorem 2 and Proposition 1 furnishes that problem (P_r) has a (positive) solution $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon) \in C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega})$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, within $[\underline{u}, \bar{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \bar{v}]$, where functions $(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ and $(\bar{u}, \bar{v})$ are sub-supersolutions of (P_r) and $(u_\varepsilon, v_\varepsilon)$ verifies*

$$u_\varepsilon(x) \ll \hat{u}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad v_\varepsilon(x) \ll \hat{v}(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Topological degree: The first estimate.

We transform the problem (P_r) to one with helpful monotonicity properties. To this end, let us introduce the functions

$$(3.6) \quad \tilde{\phi} = \begin{cases} R & \text{if } \phi \geq R \\ \phi & \text{if } \underline{u} \leq \phi \leq R \\ \underline{u} & \text{if } \phi \leq \underline{u} \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{\varphi} = \begin{cases} R & \text{if } \varphi \geq R \\ \varphi & \text{if } \underline{v} \leq \varphi \leq R \\ \underline{v} & \text{if } \varphi \leq \underline{v} \end{cases},$$

where $(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ and R are given by (2.16) and (3.1), respectively. Define the operators

$$\begin{aligned} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) &= -\Delta_p u + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, u^{p-1}\}, \\ T_{q,\varepsilon}(v) &= -\Delta_q v + \rho \max\{R^{\alpha_2} (\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2 - 1}, v^{q-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and a constant $\rho > 0$. We shall study the homotopy class of problem

$$(P_f) \quad \begin{cases} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) = f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ T_{q,\varepsilon}(v) = f_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where functions $f_{1,\varepsilon,t}$ and $f_{2,\varepsilon,t}$ are defined as follows:

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) &= t(\tilde{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m(1-t)\tilde{u}^{p-1} \\ &\quad + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \tilde{u}^{p-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) &= t\tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} (\tilde{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2} + m(1-t)\tilde{v}^{q-1} \\ &\quad + \rho \max\{R^{\alpha_2} (\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2 - 1}, \tilde{v}^{q-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

with a constant $m > \max\{\lambda_{1,p}, \lambda_{1,q}\}$. In the sequel, we fix the constant $\rho > 0$ in (P_f) sufficiently large so that the following inequalities are satisfied:

$$t\alpha_1(s_1 + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1}s_2^{\beta_1} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1}R^{\beta_1}, (p-1)s_1^{p-2}\} \geq 0$$

and

$$t\beta_2(s_2 + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2-1}s_1^{\alpha_2} + \rho \max\{R^{\alpha_2}(\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2-1}, (q-1)s_2^{q-2}\} \geq 0,$$

uniformly in $x \in \Omega$, for $(s_1, s_2) \in [\underline{u}, R] \times [\underline{v}, R]$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. By the above choice of ρ , the term in the right-hand side of first (resp. second) equation in (P_f) increases as u (resp. v) increases, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ small.

The next result is crucial in our approach, because it establishes an important prior estimate for system (P_f) . Moreover, it is also shown that the solutions of problem (P_f) cannot occur outside the rectangle formed by the subsolution $(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ and the constant R .

Proposition 2. *Assume (1.1) holds. If (u, v) is a solution of (P_f) , then (u, v) belongs to $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and satisfies*

$$(3.9) \quad \|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})}, \|v\|_{C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})} < R.$$

Moreover, it holds

$$(3.10) \quad \underline{u}(x) \ll u(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{v}(x) \ll v(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

Proof. First, by Moser's iterations technique, we prove the boundedness for solutions of (P_f) in $L^\infty(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$. Assuming (3.10) holds, it follows that

$$(3.11) \quad \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1}R^{\beta_1}, u^{p-1}\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1}R^{\beta_1}, \tilde{u}^{p-1}\} \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega$$

and

$$(3.12) \quad \max\{R^{\alpha_2}(\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2}, v^{q-1}\} - \max\{R^{\alpha_2}(\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2}, \tilde{v}^{q-1}\} \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Then,

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p u \leq \tilde{u}^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m \tilde{u}^{p-1} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q v \leq \tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} \tilde{v}^{\beta_2} + m \tilde{v}^{q-1} \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u, v > 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u, v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Given a constant $A \in (0, R]$, define on Ω the functions

$$u_A = \min\{u(x), A\} \quad \text{and} \quad v_A = \min\{v(x), A\}.$$

Acting on (P_f) with

$$(\varphi, \psi) = \left(u_A^{k_1 p + 1}, v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q + 1} \right),$$

where

$$(3.14) \quad (k_1 + 1)p = p^* \quad \text{and} \quad (\bar{k}_1 + 1)q = q^*,$$

and integrating over Ω we get

$$(3.15) \quad (k_1 p + 1) \int_\Omega |\nabla u_A|^p u_A^{k_1 p} dx \leq \int_\Omega (\tilde{u}^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m \tilde{u}^{p-1}) u_A^{k_1 p} dx$$

and

$$(3.16) \quad (\bar{k}_1 q + 1) \int_\Omega |\nabla v_A|^q v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q} dx \leq \int_\Omega (\tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} \tilde{v}^{\beta_2} + m \tilde{v}^{q-1}) v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q + 1} dx.$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, the left-hand sides of (3.15) and (3.16) are estimated from below as follows

$$(3.17) \quad (k_1 p + 1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_A|^p u_A^{k_1 p} = \frac{k_1 p + 1}{(k_1 + 1)^p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_A^{k_1 + 1}|^p \geq C_1 \frac{(k_1 p + 1)}{(k_1 + 1)^p} \|u_A\|_{(k_1 + 1)p^*}^{p^*}$$

and

$$(3.18) \quad (\bar{k}_1 q + 1) \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_A|^q v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q} = \frac{(\bar{k}_1 q + 1)}{(\bar{k}_1 + 1)^q} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla v_A^{\bar{k}_1 + 1}|^q \geq C_1' \frac{(\bar{k}_1 q + 1)}{(\bar{k}_1 + 1)^q} \|v_A\|_{(\bar{k}_1 + 1)q^*}^{q^*},$$

where C_1 and C_1' are some positive constants. By noticing that $k_1 p + 1 + \alpha_1 > 0$ and $\bar{k}_1 q + 1 + \beta_2 > 0$ it turns out that

$$(3.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{u}^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m \tilde{u}^{p-1}) u_A^{k_1 p + 1} dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} u_A^{\alpha_1 + k_1 p + 1} v^{\beta_1} dx + m \int_{\Omega} u^{(k_1 + 1)p} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha_1 + k_1 p + 1} v^{\beta_1} dx + m \int_{\Omega} u^{(k_1 + 1)p} dx \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} (\tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} \tilde{v}^{\beta_2} + m \tilde{v}^{q-1}) v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q + 1} dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha_2} v_A^{\bar{k}_1 q + 1 + \beta_2} dx + m \int_{\Omega} v^{(\bar{k}_1 + 1)q} dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha_2} v^{\bar{k}_1 q + 1 + \beta_2} dx + m \int_{\Omega} v^{(\bar{k}_1 + 1)q} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then, following the quite similar argument as in [30], we obtain that $(u, v) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \times L^\infty(\Omega)$ and there exists a constant $L > 0$, independent of R , such that $\|u\|_\infty, \|v\|_\infty \leq L$. Furthermore, from (2.16) and (2.9), it holds

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{u}^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m \tilde{u}^{p-1} &\leq \tilde{u}^{\alpha_1} (\tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + m \tilde{u}^{p-1-\alpha_1}) \\ &\leq \underline{u}^{\alpha_1} (\|v\|_\infty^{\beta_1} + m \|u\|_\infty^{p-1-\alpha_1}) \\ &\leq (C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p})^{\alpha_1} (L^{\beta_1} + m L^{p-1-\alpha_1}) \leq C_1 d(x)^{\alpha_1} \quad \text{in } \Omega \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.22) \quad \tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} \tilde{v}^{\beta_2} + m \tilde{v}^{q-1} \leq \underline{v}^{\beta_2} (\|u\|_\infty^{\alpha_2} + m \|v\|_\infty^{q-1-\beta_2}) \leq C_2 d(x)^{\beta_2} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

with positive constants C_1 and C_2 . Thus, on the basis of (3.11), (3.12), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.13), the nonlinear regularity theory found in [21] guarantees that the solutions (u, v) of (P_f) belong to $C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\bar{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and satisfy (3.9).

Now, let us prove (3.10). We only show the first inequality in (3.10) because the second one can be justified similarly. To this end, we set the functions $f, g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = C^{-(p-1)} h_1(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\}$$

and

$$g(x) = f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}).$$

By Remark 1, the strict inequalities in (2.10), (2.14) and the monotonicity of $f_{1,\varepsilon,t}$ imply

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= -C^{-(p-1)} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} \\ &< t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{u}^{\beta_1} + (1 - t)m \underline{u}^{p-1} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} \\ &= f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \underline{u}, \underline{v}) \leq f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = g(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega_\delta \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= -C^{-(p-1)} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} \\ &< (\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{u}^{\beta_1} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_\delta, \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. On another hand, by (2.9), (1.1), (2.16), (2.12) and (1.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} &= (t + 1 - t)(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} \\
 &\leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1 - t)(C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p})^{\alpha_1} (C^{-1} c'_1 \phi_{1,q})^{\beta_1} \\
 (3.25) \quad &\leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1 - t)(C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \mu)^{\alpha_1} (C^{-1} c'_1 M)^{\beta_1} \\
 &\leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1 - t)m(C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \mu)^{p-1} \\
 &\leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1 - t)m \underline{u}^{p-1} \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta,
 \end{aligned}$$

provided that $m > 0$ sufficiently large, for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Combining (3.24) with (3.25) and using the monotonicity of $f_{1,\varepsilon,t}$, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.26) \quad f(x) &= C^{-(p-1)} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} \\
 &< f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \underline{u}, \underline{v}) \leq f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = g(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Consequently, it follows from (3.23) and (3.26) that for each compact set $K \subset \subset \Omega$, there is a constant $\tau = \tau(K) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x) + \tau &= -C^{-(p-1)} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} + \tau \\
 &\leq f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = g(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } K \cap \Omega_\delta
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x) + \tau &= C^{-(p-1)} \phi_{1,p}^{\alpha_1}(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\} + \tau \\
 &\leq f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) = g(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } K \cap \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta,
 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Hence, given a compact set $k \subset \subset \Omega$, there is $\tau > 0$ such that

$$f(x) + \tau \leq g(x), \quad \forall x \in K$$

and so, $f \prec g$ and $f, g \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Thereby, by the strong comparison principle (see Appendix, Proposition 5), we infer that

$$u(x) \gg \underline{u}(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

The proof of the second inequality in (3.10) is carried out in a similar way. This complete the proof. $\square$

Proposition 3. *Under the assumption (1.1) problem (P_f) has no solutions for $t = 0$.*

Proof. Arguing by contradiction, let $(u^*, v^*) \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, be a nontrivial (positive) solution of (P_f) with

$$(3.27) \quad (u^*, v^*) \in \mathcal{O}_R \quad \text{and } t = 0.$$

From (2.9) and (2.16)

$$\underline{u}(x) = C^{-1} z_1(x) \geq C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p}(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

In the sequel, we fix $u_1 = C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p}$ and take $\lambda_\delta = \lambda_{1,p} + \delta$ for $\delta > 0$. Let $u_2 \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_2 = \lambda_\delta u_1^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then for $\delta > 0$ small and m large enough, we have

$$-\Delta_p u_2 = \lambda_\delta u_1^{p-1} \leq m \tilde{u}^{p-1} = -\Delta_p u^*$$

and

$$-\Delta_p u_1 = \lambda_{1,p} u_1^{p-1} \leq \lambda_\delta u_1^{p-1} = -\Delta_p u_2.$$

By the weak comparison principle we get

$$u_1 \leq u_2 \leq u^* \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Now let us consider the solutions of the problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u_n = \lambda_\delta u_{n-1}^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

We obtain an increasing sequence $\{u_n\}$ such that

$$u_1 \leq u_{n-1} \leq u_n \leq u^* \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Passing to the limit we get a positive solution $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \lambda_\delta u^{p-1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

which is impossible for $\delta > 0$ small enough because the first eigenvalue for p -Laplacian is isolate. Hence, problem (P_f) has no solutions for $t = 0$. $\square$

Define the homotopy $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ on $[0, 1] \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ by

$$\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(t, u, v) = I(u, v) - \begin{pmatrix} T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{q,\varepsilon}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} f_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \\ f_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

According to Lemma 1 (see Appendix) and because functions $f_{\varepsilon,t}$ and $g_{\varepsilon,t}$ belong to $C(\overline{\Omega})$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$ is well defined. Furthermore, $\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon : [0, 1] \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C(\overline{\Omega}) \times C(\overline{\Omega})$ is completely continuous for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. This is due to the compactness of the operators $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}, T_{q,\varepsilon}^{-1} : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, see appendix for more details. Hence, $(u, v) \in \mathcal{O}_R$ is a solution for (P_r) if, and only if,

$$(u, v) \in \mathcal{O}_R \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, u, v) = 0.$$

From the previous Proposition 2 and since R is the a strict a priori bound, it is clear that solutions of (P_f) must lie in $\mathcal{O}_R$. Thus, the fact that problem (P_f) has no solutions for $t = 0$ (see proposition 3) implies that

$$\deg(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(0, \cdot, \cdot), \mathcal{O}_R, 0) = 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Consequently, from the homotopy invariance property, it follows that

$$(3.28) \quad \deg(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot), \mathcal{O}_R, 0) = \deg(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(0, \cdot, \cdot), \mathcal{O}_R, 0) = 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

Topological degree: The second estimate.

We show that the degree of an operator corresponding to the system (P_r) is 1 on the set $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. To this end, we modify the problem to ensure that solutions cannot occur outside of the rectangle formed by $(\underline{u}, \underline{v})$ and $(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$. Set

$$(3.29) \quad \tilde{u} = \begin{cases} \hat{u} & \text{if } u \geq \hat{u} \\ u & \text{if } \underline{u} \leq u \leq \hat{u} \\ \underline{u} & \text{if } u \leq \underline{u} \end{cases}, \quad \tilde{v} = \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } v \geq \hat{v} \\ v & \text{if } \underline{v} \leq v \leq \hat{v} \\ \underline{v} & \text{if } v \leq \underline{v}, \end{cases}$$

and let us define the truncation problem

$$(P_g) \quad \begin{cases} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) = g_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ T_{q,\varepsilon}(v) = g_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u, v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} g_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) &= t(\tilde{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \tilde{v}^{\beta_1} + (1-t)\eta(\phi_{1,p} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \\ &\quad + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, \tilde{u}^{p-1}\}, \\ g_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) &= t\tilde{u}^{\alpha_2} (\tilde{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2} + (1-t)\eta(\phi_{1,q} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2} \\ &\quad + \rho \max\{R^{\alpha_2} (\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2-1}, \tilde{v}^{q-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

with a constant $\eta > 0$. The constant $\rho > 0$ is chosen sufficiently large so that the following inequalities are satisfy:

$$\alpha_1(s_1 + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} s_2^{\beta_1} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, (p-1)s_1^{p-2}\} \geq 0,$$

uniformly in $x \in \Omega$, for $(s_1, s_2) \in [\underline{u}, \hat{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \hat{v}]$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and

$$\beta_2 s_1^{\alpha_2} (s_2 + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2-1} + \rho \max\{R^{\alpha_2} (\underline{v} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2-1}, (q-1)s_2^{q-2}\} \geq 0,$$

uniformly in $x \in \Omega$, for $(s_1, s_2) \in [\underline{u}, \hat{u}] \times [\underline{v}, \hat{v}]$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

We state the following result regarding truncation system (P_g) .

Proposition 4. *Under condition (1.1) every solution (u, v) of (P_g) is in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, with $\|u\|_{C^{1,\gamma}}, \|v\|_{C^{1,\gamma}} < R$ and satisfies*

$$(3.30) \quad \underline{u}(x) \ll u(x) \ll \hat{u}(x) \text{ and } \underline{v}(x) \ll v(x) \ll \hat{v}(x), \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

Proof. A quite similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 2 provides that all solutions of (P_g) are in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

Let us prove (3.30). We only show the first part of inequalities in (3.30) because the second part can be justified similarly. To this end, we set the functions $f, \tilde{g} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f(x) = C^{-(p-1)} h_1(x) + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, \underline{u}^{p-1}\}$$

and

$$\tilde{g}(x) = g_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}).$$

From Remark 1, (2.9) and (1.8), for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and for all $t \in [0, 1]$, that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.31) \quad & (t+1-t)(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} \\ & \leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1-t)(C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} (C^{-1} c'_1 \phi_{1,q})^{\beta_1} \\ & \leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1-t)(C^{-1} \frac{c_0}{2} \phi_{1,p})^{\alpha_1} (C^{-1} c'_1 M)^{\beta_1} \\ & \leq t(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \underline{v}^{\beta_1} + (1-t)\eta(\phi_{1,p} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} \text{ in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\delta \end{aligned}$$

provided that $\eta > 0$ is sufficiently large. Then, following the quite similar argument which proves (3.10) in Proposition 2, we obtain for each compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there is a constant $\tau = \tau(K) > 0$ such that

$$f(x) + \tau \leq \tilde{g}(x) \quad \text{a.e in } \Omega.$$

Hence, $f \prec \tilde{g}$ and $f, \tilde{g} \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. Thereby, by the strong comparison principle (see Proposition 5 in Appendix) we infer that

$$u(x) \gg \underline{u}(x) \quad \forall x \in \Omega.$$

□

Let us define the homotopy $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ on $[0, 1] \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ by

$$(3.32) \quad \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(t, u, v) = I(u, v) - \begin{pmatrix} T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & T_{q,\varepsilon}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) \\ g_{2,\varepsilon,t}(x, u, v) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, Lemma 1 together with Proposition 6 (see Appendix) imply that $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ is well defined and completely continuous homotopy for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and all $t \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, $(u, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is a solution of system (P_r) if, and only if,

$$(u, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(1, u, v) = 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1).$$

In view of Proposition 4 and from the definition of function $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{v}$ it follows that all solutions of (P_g) are also solutions of (P_r) . Moreover, these solutions must be in the set $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Moreover, for $t = 0$ in (3.32), Minty-Browder Theorem together with Hardy-Sobolev Inequality and [21, Lemma 3.1] ensure that problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta_p u = \eta(\phi_{1,p} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_q v = \eta(\phi_{1,q} + \varepsilon)^{\beta_2} & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

admit unique positive solutions $\hat{u}_\varepsilon$ and $\hat{v}_\varepsilon$ in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, respectively. Then, the homotopy invariance property of the degree gives

$$(3.33) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg(\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot), \hat{\mathcal{O}}, 0) &= \deg(\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(0, \cdot, \cdot), \hat{\mathcal{O}}, 0) \\ &= \deg(\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(0, \cdot, \cdot), B_R(0)), 0) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot) = \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot) \text{ in } \hat{\mathcal{O}},$$

it follows that

$$(3.34) \quad \deg(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot), \hat{\mathcal{O}}, 0) = 1,$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Topological degree: The third estimate.

Herafter, we will assume that

$$\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, u, v) \neq 0 \quad \forall (u, v) \in \partial\hat{\mathcal{O}},$$

otherwise we will have a solution $(\check{u}_\varepsilon, \check{v}_\varepsilon) \in \partial\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, which is different from the solution (u, v) in Theorem 2, because $(u, v) \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Here, we have used that $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is an open set, then $(u, v) \notin \partial\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

By (3.33), (3.34) and (3.28), we deduce from the excision property of Leray-Schauder degree that

$$\deg(\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon(1, \cdot, \cdot), \mathcal{O}_R \setminus \overline{\hat{\mathcal{O}}}, 0) = -1$$

and thus problem (P_r) has a solution $(\check{u}_\varepsilon, \check{v}_\varepsilon) \in C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ with

$$(3.35) \quad (\check{u}_\varepsilon, \check{v}_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{O}_R \setminus \overline{\hat{\mathcal{O}}}$$

In view of remark (1), $(\check{u}_\varepsilon, \check{v}_\varepsilon)$ is necessarily another solution for problem (P_r) .

Proof of Theorem 1:

Set $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}$ with any positive integer $n \geq 1$. From (3.35) with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}$, we know that there exist $(\check{u}_n, \check{v}_n) := (\check{u}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \check{v}_{\frac{1}{n}})$ bounded in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ for some $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$(3.36) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta_p \check{u}_n = (\check{u}_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\alpha_1} \check{v}_n^{\beta_1} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ -\Delta_q \check{v}_n = \check{u}_n^{\alpha_2} (\check{v}_n + \frac{1}{n})^{\beta_2} & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \check{u}_n = \check{v}_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

satisfying

$$(3.37) \quad (\check{u}_n, \check{v}_n) \in \mathcal{O}_R \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Employing Arzelà-Ascoli's theorem, we may pass to the limit in $C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and the limit functions $(\check{u}, \check{v}) \in C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ satisfy (P) with

$$(3.38) \quad (\check{u}, \check{v}) \in \mathcal{O}_R \setminus \overline{\mathcal{O}}$$

Finally, on account of (3.38) and Proposition 1, we achieve that $(\check{u}, \check{v})$ is a second solution of problem (P). This complete the proof of Theorem 1.

4. APPENDIX

In this section, we establish a version of the strong comparison principle for the operators $T_{p,\varepsilon}$ and $T_{q,\varepsilon}$ introduced in Section 3 and we study the compactness of the inverse of these operators. We only prove the strong comparison principle for the operator $T_{p,\varepsilon}$ and the compactness of $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ because for $T_{q,\varepsilon}$ and $T_{q,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ the proof can be justified similarly.

1. Strong comparison principle.

Proposition 5. *Let $u_1, u_2 \in C^{1,\beta}(\overline{\Omega})$, $\beta \in (0, 1)$, be the solutions of the problems*

$$\begin{cases} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_1) = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_2) = g(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) = -\Delta_p u + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, |u|^{p-2} u\},$$

for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $f, g \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. If $f \prec g$, that is, for each compact set $K \subset \Omega$, there is $\tau = \tau(K) > 0$ such that

$$f(x) + \tau \leq g(x) \quad \text{a.e in } K,$$

then $u_1 \ll u_2$.

Proof. The proof is very similar to those of Proposition 2.6 in [4], it is sufficient to observe that for all $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ the following inequality holds:

$$(4.1) \quad |\max\{a, b\} - \max\{c, d\}| \leq \max\{|a - c|, |b - d|\},$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & |\max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_1|^{p-2} u_1\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1 - 1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_2|^{p-2} u_2\}| \\ & \leq \left| |u_1|^{p-2} u_1 - |u_2|^{p-2} u_2 \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is a key point in the arguments found in [4]. $\square$

2. Compactness of $T_{p,\varepsilon}$.

Let us consider the Dirichlet problem

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $f \in W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ and $T_{p,\varepsilon} : W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)$ is the operator defined as follows:

$$T_{p,\varepsilon}(u) = -\Delta_p u + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u|^{p-2} u\}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

A solution of (4.2) is understood in the weak sense, that is $u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$(4.3) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u \nabla \varphi + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u|^{p-2} u\} \varphi \right) dx = \int_{\Omega} f(x) \varphi dx$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Lemma 1. *Problem (4.2) possesses a unique solution u_{ε} in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Moreover, if $f \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ the solution u_{ε} belongs to $C^{1,\gamma}(\Omega)$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and satisfies*

$$(4.4) \quad \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{C^{1,\gamma}} < \overline{R},$$

where $\overline{R}$ is a positive constant, which depends of $\|f\|_{\infty}$.

Proof. To prove the lemma we apply Minty-Browder Theorem. To do so, we prove that the operator $T_{p,\varepsilon}$ is continuous, strict monotone and coercive for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Let us show that $T_{p,\varepsilon}$ is a continuous operator. For $\{u_n\} \subset W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ with $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_n) - T_{p,\varepsilon}(u)\|_{W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)} &= \sup_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \|\varphi\|_{1,p} \leq 1} |\langle T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_n) - T_{p,\varepsilon}(u), \varphi \rangle| \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \left| \langle (|\nabla u_n|^{p-2} \nabla u_n - |\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u), \nabla \varphi \rangle \right| dx \\ &\quad + \rho \int_{\Omega} \left| \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_n|^{p-2} u_n\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u|^{p-2} u\} \right| |\varphi| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Then if $p \geq 2$, using [18, Lemma 5.3] together with Hölder's inequality and (4.1), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_n) - T_{p,\varepsilon}(u)\|_{W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)} &\leq c_p \| |\nabla u| + |\nabla u| \|_p^{p'(p-2)} \|u_n - u\|_{1,p}^{p'} \\ (4.5) \quad &+ \rho \sup_{\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega), \|\varphi\|_{1,p} \leq 1} \int_{\Omega} \left| \max\{0, |u_n|^{p-2} u_n - |u|^{p-2} u\} \right| |\varphi| dx \\ &\leq C (\|u_n\|_{1,p} + \|u\|_{1,p})^{p'(p-2)} \|u_n - u\|_{1,p}^{p'} + \rho \left\| |u_n|^{p-2} u_n - |u|^{p-2} u \right\|_{p'}, \end{aligned}$$

with some constant $C > 0$. If $1 < p < 2$ [18, Lemma 5.4] and Hölder's inequality imply that

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} &\|T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_n) - T_{p,\varepsilon}(u)\|_{W^{-1,p'}(\Omega)} \\ &\leq c_p \|u_n - u\|_{1,p} + \rho \left\| |u_n|^{p-2} u_n - |u|^{p-2} u \right\|_{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the operator $L_{p,\varepsilon}$ is continuous for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

Now we claim that $L_{p,\varepsilon}$ is strict monotone and coercive. Indeed, let $u_1, u_2 \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. We note that the integral

$$(4.7) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left(\max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_1|^{p-2} u_1\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_2|^{p-2} u_2\} \right) (u_1 - u_2) dx$$

is positive because

$$(4.8) \quad \left(\max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_1|^{p-2} u_1\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_2|^{p-2} u_2\} \right) (u_1 - u_2) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega.$$

Then for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_1) - T_{p,\varepsilon}(u_2), u_1 - u_2 \rangle &= \int_{\Omega} \langle (|\nabla u_1|^{p-2} \nabla u_1 - |\nabla u_2|^{p-2} \nabla u_2), \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \rangle dx \\ &+ \rho \int_{\Omega} \left(\max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_1|^{p-2} u_1\} - \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_2|^{p-2} u_2\} \right) (u_1 - u_2) dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \langle (|\nabla u_1|^{p-2} \nabla u_1 - |\nabla u_2|^{p-2} \nabla u_2), \nabla(u_1 - u_2) \rangle dx \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows due to the strict monotonicity of $-\Delta_p$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. The coercivity of the operator $T_{1,\varepsilon}$ can be proved easily using the coercivity of $-\Delta_p$. Now we are able to apply the Minty-Browder theorem which guarantees the existence of a unique solution for problem (4.2) in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

Next we show that solutions u_{ε} of (4.2) are in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. The proof is based on Moser's iterations technique combined with nonlinear regularity theory (see [26]).

For $M > 0$, define on Ω the function $u_{\varepsilon,M}(x) = \min(u_{\varepsilon}(x), M)$. We act on (4.3) with $\varphi = u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1}$ where

$$(4.9) \quad (k_1 + 1)p = p^*$$

which gives

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \left((k_1 p + 1) |\nabla u_{\varepsilon,M}|^p u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_{\varepsilon}|^{p-2} u_{\varepsilon}\} u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} f(x) u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} dx \end{aligned}$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, the left-hand side of (4.10) is estimated from below as follows

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega} \left((k_1 p + 1) |\nabla u_{\varepsilon,M}|^p u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p} + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_{\varepsilon}|^{p-2} u_{\varepsilon}\} u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \left((k_1 p + 1) |\nabla u_{\varepsilon,M}|^p u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p} + \rho |u_{\varepsilon}|^{p-2} u_{\varepsilon} u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} \right) dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \left((k_1 p + 1) |\nabla u_{\varepsilon,M}|^p u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p} + \rho u_{\varepsilon,M}^{(k_1+1)p} \right) dx \\ &= \frac{k_1 p + 1}{(k_1 + 1)^p} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1+1}|^p + \rho \|u_{\varepsilon,M}\|_{p^*}^{p^*} \geq C_1 \frac{(k_1 p + 1)}{(k_1 + 1)^p} \|u_{\varepsilon,M}\|_{(k_1+1)p^*}^{p^*} \end{aligned}$$

where C_1 is some positive constant. From (4.9), the right-hand side of (4.10) is estimated from above by

$$(4.12) \quad \int_{\Omega} f(x) u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} \leq \|f\|_{\infty} \int_{\Omega} u_{\varepsilon,M}^{k_1 p + 1} \leq \|f\|_{\infty} \|u_{\varepsilon}\|_{p^*}^{k_1 p + 1}.$$

Following the same arguments as in [30] we obtain that $u_{\varepsilon} \in L^{\infty}(\Omega)$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Then from the nonlinear regularity theory (see [26]) we infer that $u_{\varepsilon} \in$

$C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$, for certain $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\gamma}} < \overline{R}$ for a large constant $\overline{R} > 0$ and for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. $\square$

Lemma 1 ensures that the inverse operator

$$T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1} : C(\overline{\Omega}) \rightarrow C^1(\overline{\Omega})$$

is well defined for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. The next proposition gives some properties regarding $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$.

Proposition 6. *The operator $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ is continuous and compact for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.*

Proof. First, let us show that $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ is a continuous operator. So let $f_n \rightarrow f$ in $C(\overline{\Omega})$. Denoting $u_n = T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}(f_n)$ reads as

$$(4.13) \quad \int_{\Omega} \left(|\nabla u_n|^{p-2} \nabla u_n \nabla \varphi + \rho \max\{(\underline{u} + \varepsilon)^{\alpha_1-1} R^{\beta_1}, |u_n|^{p-2} u_n\} \varphi \right) dx = \int_{\Omega} f_n(x) \varphi dx$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Since by (4.4) the sequence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, along a relabeled subsequence there holds

$$(4.14) \quad u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ with some } u \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega).$$

Setting $\varphi = u_n - u$ in (4.13). Then Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem ensures

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle -\Delta_p u_n, u_n - u \rangle = 0.$$

The S_+ property of $-\Delta_p$ on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$ along with (4.14) implies $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. Furthermore, the boundedness of the sequence $\{u_n\}$ in $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega})$ and since the embedding $C^{1,\gamma}(\overline{\Omega}) \subset C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is compact, it turns out that along a relabeled subsequence, one has the fact that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Finally, (4.13) result in $u = T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}(f)$, proving that $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ is continuous operator.

Next, we show that $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}(C(\overline{\Omega}))$ is a relatively compact subset of $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$. Let $u_n = T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}(f_n)$ with $f_n \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ for all n . Following the same reasoning as before, we find $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that, along a relabeled subsequence, $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, thereby the relative compactness of $T_{p,\varepsilon}^{-1}$ is proven. $\square$

Acknowledgements 1. *The work was accomplished while the second author was visiting the University Federal of Campina Grande with CNPq-Brazil fellowship N° 402792/2015-7. He thanks for hospitality.*

REFERENCES

- [1] C. O. Alves & F. J. S. A. Corrêa, *On the existence of positive solution for a class of singular systems involving quasilinear operators*, Appl. Math. Comput. 185 (2007), 727-736.
- [2] C. O. Alves, F. J. S. A. Corrêa & J.V.A. Gonçalves, *Existence of solutions for some classes of singular Hamiltonian systems*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. 5 (2005), 265-278.
- [3] C. O. Alves & A. Moussaoui, *Existence of solutions for a class of singular elliptic systems with convection term*, Asymptotic Analysis 90 (2014), 237-248.
- [4] D. Arcoya & D. Ruiz, *The Ambrosetti-Prodi problem for the p -Laplace operator*, Comm. Partial Diff. Eqs. 31 (2006), 849-865.
- [5] R.P. Agarwal & D. O'Regan, *Existence theory for single and multiple solutions to singular positive boundary value problems*, J. Diff. Equat. 175 (2001), 393-414.
- [6] H. Brézis, *Analyse fonctionnelle theorie et applications*, Masson, Paris, 1983.
- [7] S. Carl, V. K. Le & D. Motreanu, *Nonsmooth variational problems and their inequalities. Comparison principles and applications*, Springer, New York, 2007.

- [8] P. Clément, J. Fleckinger, E. Mitidieri & F. De Thelin, *Existence of Positive Solutions for a Nonvariational Quasilinear Elliptic System*, J. Diff. Eqs. 166 (2000), 455-477.
- [9] M. M. Coclite & G. Palmieri, *On a singular nonlinear Dirichlet problem*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equat. 14 (1989), 1315-1327.
- [10] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz & L. Tartar, *On a Dirichlet problem with singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equat. 2 (1977), 193-222.
- [11] M. del Pino, *A priori estimates applications to existence-nonexistence for a semilinear elliptic system*, Ind. University Math. J. 43 (1994), 77-129.
- [12] I. Diaz, J. M. Morel & L. Oswald, *An elliptic equation with singular nonlinearity*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equat. 12 (1987), 1333-1344.
- [13] W. Fulks & J. S. Maybee, *A singular non-linear equation*, Osaka Math. J. 12 (1960), 1-19.
- [14] M. Ghergu, *Lane-Emden systems with negative exponents*, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010), 3295-3318.
- [15] J. Giacomoni, J. Hernandez & A. Moussaoui, *Quasilinear and singular systems: the cooperative case*, Contemporary Math. 540 (2011), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 79-94.
- [16] J. Giacomoni, J. Hernandez & P. Savvy, *Quasilinear and singular elliptic systems*, Advances Nonl. Anal. 2 (2013), 1-41.
- [17] J. Giacomoni, I. Schindler & P. Takac, *Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizers and existence of multiple solutions for a singular quasilinear equation*, A. Sc. N. Sup. Pisa (5) 6 (2007), 117-158.
- [18] R. Glowinski & A. Marroco, *Sur l'approximation par éléments finis d'ordre un, et la résolution, par pénalisation-dualité d'une classe de problèmes de Dirichlet non linéaires*, Univ. Paris VI et CNRS, 189, nr. 74023.
- [19] M. Ghergu & V. Radulescu, *On a class of Gierer-Meinhardt systems arising in morphogenesis*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 344 (2007), 163-168.
- [20] A. Gierer & H. Meinhardt, *A theory of biological pattern formation*, Kybernetik 12 (1972), 30-39.
- [21] D. D. Hai, *On a class of singular p -Laplacian boundary value problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 383 (2011), 619-626.
- [22] J. Hernandez, F. J. Mancebo & J. M. Vega, *Positive solutions for singular semilinear elliptic systems*, Adv. Diff. Eqs. 13 (2008), 857-880.
- [23] O. Kavian, *Introduction à la Théorie des Points Critiques et Applications aux Problèmes Elliptiques*, Springer, Paris-Berlin-Heidelberg, 1993.
- [24] B. Khodja & A. Moussaoui, *Positive solutions for infinite semipositone/positone quasilinear elliptic systems with singular and superlinear terms*, Submitted.
- [25] A. C. Lazer & P. J. McKenna, *On a singular nonlinear elliptic boundary-value problem*, Proc. American Math. Soc. 3 (111), 1991.
- [26] G. M. Lieberman, *Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations*, Nonlinear Anal. 12 (1988), 1203-1219.
- [27] C. D. Luning & W. L. Perry, *Positive solutions of negative exponent generalized Emden-Fowler boundary value problem*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 12 (1981), 874-879.
- [28] D. Motreanu & A. Moussaoui, *A quasilinear singular elliptic system without cooperative structure*, Act. Math. Sci. 34 B (3) (2014), 905-916.
- [29] D. Motreanu & A. Moussaoui, *An existence result for a class of quasilinear singular competitive elliptic systems*, Applied Math. Letters 38 (2014), 33-37.
- [30] D. Motreanu & A. Moussaoui, *Existence and boundedness of solutions for a singular cooperative quasilinear elliptic system*, Complex Var. Elliptic Eqs. 59 (2014), 285-296.
- [31] A. Moussaoui, B. Khodja & S. Tas, *A singular Gierer-Meinhardt system of elliptic equations in R^N* , Nonlinear Anal. 71 (2009), 708-716.
- [32] C. A. Stuart, *Existence and approximations of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Math. Z. 147 (1976), 53-63.
- [33] S. Taliaferro, *A nonlinear singular boundary value problem*, Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl. (1979) 897-904.
- [34] J. L. Vazquez, *A strong maximum principle for some quasilinear elliptic equations*, Appl. Math. Optim. 12 (1984), 191-202.
- [35] Z. Zhang, *On a Dirichlet with a singular nonlinearity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 194 (1995), 103-113.

- [36] Z. Zhang & J. Yu, *On a singular nonlinear Dirichlet problem with a convection term*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 32 (2000), 916-927.

CLAUDIANOR O. ALVES, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE CAMPINA GRANDE, UNIDADE ACADÊMICA DE MATEMÁTICA, CEP:58429-900, CAMPINA GRANDE - PB, BRAZIL.

E-mail address: `coalves@mat.ufcg.edu.br`

ABDELKRIM MOUSSAOUI, BIOLOGY DEPARTMENT, A. MIRA BEJAIA UNIVERSITY, TARGA OUZEMOUR, 06000 BEJAIA, ALGERIA.

E-mail address: `abdelkrim.moussaoui@univ-bejaia.dz`